



IFW

August 17, 2006

COPY

Hal Richardson
1220 E Sagebrush St.
Gilbert, AZ 85296
480 892 0154 hm
480 200 1220 cell

United States Patent and Trademark Office
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Application No. 10/699,594
Reply to final rejection mailed 6/14/06

Mr. Chin Shue,

I am writing in response to your final rejection of my patent application. I do not want to use an attorney any further, so when you reply, reply to me at the above address. Your final rejection is not proper. The last 3 years have been a waste of my time and money and it will not continue. If you will not grant me a patent, then I will not spend thousands of dollars more on lawyers to try and overcome your prejudice against my idea.

The Constitution in Art. 1, section 8 states concerning inventions, "promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to inventors the exclusive right to their discoveries". I deserve this right.

My device saves lives. Regardless of your trained *legal only* outlook on this invention, it is not like the other patents you cited. I never knew of any of them or have seen them in the field in my 33 years with the Fire Service. My Chief on Tempe Fire Department says he has never seen any device as good as this one and he has 35 years in the Fire Service.

You throw terms like "knowledge of the art" around, but you have no idea of the difference between my device and the others you form your rejection on. I am one with knowledge of the art and I had no idea of the existence of the other patents you state that I "modified" to make mine. That is not true. And if you laid them all in front of me, none of them have anything to do with a Self Contained Breathing Apparatus (SCBA). That is the whole concept behind my idea.

Waist belts, leg loops, line, descender, etc., are used in just about any type of harness in the climbing, rescue, caving, and rope world. It is the combination of items that is making my device "new". All of the patents you site have these things and the wording of the claims uses these terms.



Let me say this, as I am not a lawyer and need to talk in plain English, concerning a comparison of my invention with the other Patents used for rejection:

- None of the other inventions use a SCBA harness conversion. A firefighter should be wearing his SCBA in any hazardous atmosphere and with my invention would have several ways to escape or rescue his partner with them.
- None of the other inventions use a Class 3 (enclosed body) Harness. Mine does. It is by far the safest one of all the inventions. You can rescue your unconscious buddy with my Harness System without dropping them.
- My system is faster and simpler than all of the others. It can be put into service in seconds and in the dark.
- My device is not bulky as the others and is not noticeable when stowed. It only weighs 2 lbs.
- My device has many other uses other than just escape from upper floors or roofs:
 - * The Harness can be used to securely enclose a downed firefighter in a Class 3 Harness, enabling him to be dragged from danger with a great advantage.
 - * It can be used by a rescuer to attach his own Harness crotch strap to the downed firefighters Harness and drag him out with ease and speed to safety. 2 firefighters can work with the Harness like a team of horses. None of the other mentioned Patents can do this.

This product is needed out there in the Fire Service. In October of 2004, four Bronx Firefighters jumped to their deaths from a 4-story building. My system would have saved them all. This system will save lives. It would be much easier to manufacture and distribute this system with a patent. It should be on every Firefighters SCBA to give them options to save themselves and others.

Thank you for your consideration,

Hal Richardson

P.S. Enclosed are what I claim, in my own language and not that of the lawyers.

CC: Richard Chilcot